

The World-affirming Vision of Non-duality Vaiṣṇava Vedānta Contribution to Deep Ecology

Kiyokazu Okita
University of Oxford / University of Hamburg

1. Introduction

The Time magazine, issued this October, features a special report entitled ‘Heroes of the Environment’. The report concerns visionaries, entrepreneurs, activists, and scientists who grapple with environmental issues. In the article it is said: ‘They [i.e. visionaries and activists] remind us that in the face of human creativity and will, no challenge is too great, and no battle is unwinnable – if only we’ll fight.’

Can religions be resources for our fight against environmental issues? The article portrays, for example, Craig Sorley. He is an eco-evangelist, who argues that the Bible makes it imperative that Christians care for nature. Also Balbir Singh Seechewal, a Sikh holy man, who exercised leadership in cleaning the Kali Bein River, by utilizing the concept of voluntary service (*kar sewa*). What do the Hindu traditions have to offer?

In this paper, I argue that the rich Vedāntic traditions developed in South Asia, particularly the tradition of the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava Vedānta view of nature, offer a fertile ground for formulating an ecosophy. I will focus my attention on the concept of primordial nature ‘*Prakṛti*’ and its relation to the transcendental reality ‘*Brahman*’,

In what follows, first I discuss the development of Ecosophy in the West and what is called the Deep Ecology movement started by a Norwegian philosopher Arne Naess. Here, it will be pointed out that Naess’s Ecosophy is deeply influenced by Gandhi’s vision of non-dualism. Then, in the following section, in order to identify the Hindu Ecosophy which best articulates Gandhi’s vision, I will discuss the views of *Prakṛti* and their ecological implications according to the four schools of Vedānta namely, Advaita, Viśiṣṭādvaita, Dvaita, and Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava Vedānta.

2. Cause for the Current Ecological Crisis and Need for a New Ecosophy

At the beginning, let us for a moment consider why it is important to examine our perception of nature. It is significant to reexamine our metaphysical understanding of nature because much of how we deal with nature is greatly influenced by how we perceive it. Lynn White was one of the first thinkers in the West to point out the influence of religion on ecology. In his influential paper 'The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis', he writes:

What people do about their ecology depends on what they think about themselves in relation to things around them. Human ecology is deeply conditioned by the beliefs about our nature and destiny – that is, by religion (1967: 1205).

After pointing out the vital influence of religious beliefs on our perception of nature, White further argues that our current ecological crisis is rooted in a Christian view of nature:

Especially in its Western form, Christianity is the most Anthropocentric religion the world has seen [...] Christianity, in absolute contrast to ancient paganism [...], not only established a dualism of man and nature but also insisted that it is God's will that man exploit nature for his proper ends [...] By destroying pagan animism, Christianity made it possible to exploit nature in a mood of indifference to the feelings of natural objects [...] (1967: ??).

Thus according to White, an anthropocentric view of the world provided by the Western form of Christianity has been a major cause for our current environment problems since it allows human beings to see nature as the resources for themselves.

Realizing the danger of such a Western view of nature, it was Arne Naess, a Norwegian philosopher, who started an influential 'Deep Ecology' movement in the 1970s. Naess argues that to tackle our current environmental crisis in a fundamental manner, we need to examine the paradigm on which we base our actions in this world. 'Shallow Ecology', according to Naess, is 'Fight against pollution and resource depletion, [which mainly aims at] the health and affluence of people in the developed countries (1973: ?)' This type of ecology is 'shallow' because it still maintains the anthropocentric and utilitarian view of nature, which is the same paradigm that caused our current crisis. In contrast, Naess describes some of the basic tenets of 'Deep Ecology' as 'Rejection of the man-in-environment image in favor of the relational, total-field image' and 'Biospherical egalitarianism' (1973: ?). What he means is that in deep ecology, the paradigm shifts from an anthropocentric to an 'ecocentric' world view, according to which human beings recognize themselves as an organic part of nature and according to which the significance of non-human beings is not measured based on their usefulness to human beings.

According to Naess, such an 'ecocentric' view of nature is achieved through developing what he calls the 'ecological self'. In his article titled 'Self-realization', he suggests that when we identify ourselves with our environment, protection of nature spontaneously follows since it has become a part of our 'Self':

Care flows naturally if the 'self' is widened and deepened so that protection of free Nature is felt and conceived as protection of ourselves ... just as we do not need morals to make us breathe ... [so] if your 'self' in the wide sense embraces another being, you need no moral exhortation to show care (1987: 39-40)

In the same article, Naess writes that his idea of 'ecological self' is metaphysically influenced by Gandhi:

As a student and admirer since 1930 of Gandhi's non-violent direct actions in bloody conflict, I am inevitably influenced by his metaphysics which to him personally furnished tremendously powerful motivation and which contributed to keeping him going until his death (1987: 38).

Specifically, Naess was influenced by Gandhi's vision of non-duality (advaita). In the essay, he quotes Gandhi's own words:

The rockbottom foundation of the technique for achieving the power of non-violence is belief in the essential oneness of all life [...] I believe in advaita (non-duality), I believe in the essential unity of man and, for that matter, of all that lives (1987: 39).

Naess directly applies the Gandhian vision of unity among all forms of life to his Deep Ecology movement, arguing that by identifying oneself with nature, one is naturally prompted to protect the environment.

What precisely then, is Gandhi's view of non-duality? Being influenced by the dominant presence of Advaita Vedānta in the Western perception of Hindu traditions, scholars such as Warwick Fox (1995) and Knut Jacobsen (1996) tried to trace Gandhi's thought into Śaṅkara's monism. But is Śaṅkara's Advaita Vedānta conducive to our ecological concern? Now let us examine the view of nature according to Advaita Vedānta and its implications.

3. The Advaita Vedānta View of Nature

In the tradition of Vedānta, much of the discussion regarding nature was focused on the relationship between the material cause of nature called *Prakṛti* and the transcendental reality called *Brahman*; whether the former is a part of or identical with the latter, or if they are completely separate. Or to put it another way, one of the main philosophical questions in Vedānta has been whether or not *Brahman* is the material cause (*upādāna-kāraṇa*) of nature. Since the Upaniṣads, on which the systems of Vedānta are based, testify the unitary nature of reality, all the Vedāntic

schools in one way or another have to accept *Brahman* as the single ultimate principle from which everything else derives. All the Vedāntic schools accept that *Brahman* is the efficient cause (*nimitta-kāraṇa*) of the world. That is to say, *Brahman* is the ultimate controller of the universe. However, not all the schools agree that *Brahman* is also the material cause of the world since the world we experience is obviously variegated. How can a single unitary principle be the source of multiplicity? Another difficult issue all the Vedānta schools are confronted with is the dichotomy between the perfection of *Brahman* and the imperfection of the world. If *Brahman* is completely pure, perfect, eternal, and unchanging, how can it be the basis of the world which is impure, imperfect, non-eternal and changing?

In order to deal with these difficult points, Śaṅkara proposes the theory of apparent transformation (*vivarta-vāda*) in his commentary on the VeSū 1.1.1. According to this theory, *Brahman* appears to transform itself to be the world but in reality there is no real transformation of *Brahman*. Therefore, there is no possibility of *Brahman*'s perfection being damaged. A famous example Śaṅkara gives to illustrate this point is that of the mother of pearl appearing as silver. One may sometimes mistake the mother of pearl to be silver, superimposing a wrong perception. However, silver in reality does not exist and the mother of pearl has nothing to do with silver. In the same way, the world appears to exist because of superimposition of ignorance (*avidyā*) on *Brahman*. The logical implication of this theory is that the world with its imperfections is not ultimately real. Nelson articulates this Advaita view of the world:

This mode of thinking finds its logical culmination in the teaching that, from the highest (*pāramārthika*) perspective, the world simply does not exist. [...] The world of nature and all its creatures may appear before the mind of ignorance, but in truth they are not there. Despite appearances, the idea that any being ever comes into existence is false. (2000: 72)

Thus the goal of Advaita Vedānta is not to realize the identity of the world with *Brahman*, but to realize untainted *Brahman* by completely rejecting the world, which is a false appearance originating in ignorance. Nelson argues against scholars such as Cromwell Crawford and Eliot Deutsch, who suggest that the vision of unity offered by Advaita Vedānta is conducive to environmental awareness (2000: 63-65). According to Nelson, Advaita Vedānta in its classical form is *not* conducive to developing environmental ethic:

It is difficult to see in such modes of thought anything less than an extreme version of the world-negating, transcendental *dualism* that supports environmental neglect. Advaita achieves its brand of “nonduality” not inclusively but exclusively, at great cost: the world of nature is finally cast out of the Absolute, out of existence. (2000: 79)

Thus Nelson concludes: ‘Advaita Vedānta is not the kind of nondualism that those searching for ecologically supportive modes of thought might wish it to be (2000: 65).’

Could this negative view of nature be the source of Gandhi’s non-dualism? Probably not. If the world were something ultimately to be rejected, why does anyone even bother to care about it? Gandhi’s non-dualism was different. His vision was world-affirming. This difference between Advaita Vedānta and Gandhi’s view led scholars, such as Fox and Jacobsen to conclude that Gandhi was radically deviating from traditional Hindu thought. But was Gandhi actually inspired by Śaṅkara’s Vedānta?

David Haberman points out that besides the Advaita Vedānta of Śaṅkara, there are Vaiṣṇava schools of Vedānta which are world-affirming and he argues that it was these schools of Vedānta which influenced Gandhi’s view of nature (Haberman 2006: 33). Ranchor Prime also points out Vaiṣṇava influence on Gandhi:

His parents were devout Vaishnavas. His name, Mohandas, means ‘servant of Krishna’; his favourite book was the Bhagavad Gita; he always kept in his room the Sanskrit inscription ‘O Rama’; and he died with the name of Rama on his lips. (1994: 60)

At this point, therefore, it is appropriate to examine Vaiṣṇava Vedānta views of nature and its implications.

4. The Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta View of Nature

Although various schools of Vaiṣṇavism existed long before Śaṅkara, it was Rāmānuja, a twelfth century Vaiṣṇava, who for the first time wrote a full commentary on the VeSū from a Vaiṣṇava viewpoint, and established the Viśiṣṭādvaita schools of Vedānta.

Unlike Śaṅkara, who argues for the apparent transformation of *Brahman*, Rāmānuja argues that *Prakṛti* constitutes the body (*śarīra*) of *Brahman*, and its transformation is real (*pariṇāma-vāda*). Since *Prakṛti* as the body of *Brahman* is real, the world which manifests from it is also real. In his commentary on the VeSū 1.4.23, Rāmānuja elaborates his famous ‘body-soul’ analogy. According to Rāmānuja, *Prakṛti* in the state of the cause cannot be differentiated from *Brahman* since it has no names and no forms. This is his answer to the first of the two above-mentioned philosophical questions all the Vedānta schools have to deal with, namely how single unitary *Brahman* can be the source of the world with its multiplicity. When *Prakṛti* evolves as the body of God, the world becomes manifest with its multiplicity. Thus the variegatedness of the world is real. At the same time, before its evolution, *Prakṛti* is so subtle that it is indistinguishable from *Brahman*. In this sense, there is oneness of *Brahman* and *Prakṛti*.

How does Rāmānuja deal with the second of the challenging questions? Namely, how *Brahman*, which is perfect and completely pure, can be the source of the world, which is imperfect and impure? In his commentary to the VeSū 1.4.27, Rāmānuja replies that the nature of *Brahman*’s evolution (*pariṇāma*) is such that the impurities (*doṣa*) of the living entity and the world do not afflict *Brahman* even

though *Brahman* is the material cause and has the living entity and the matter as its body. According to Rāmānuja, *Brahman* is the material cause in the sense that it has the living entity and the matter as its body. It transforms itself in the sense that its body becomes manifest and distinct. However, *Brahman* as the controller (*niyantr*) of the living entity and the matter is always aloof from imperfections and modifications of that which it controls.

In this way Rāmānuja suggests that *Prakṛti* is the body of *Brahman*. What, then, would be the implications of such a view of *Prakṛti* with regard to our ecological concerns? According to Patricia Mumme, the Viśiṣṭādvaita view of *Prakṛti* as the body of God is conducive to our ecological concern since it helps us to recognize the sacredness of nature and the interrelatedness of all the creatures. As we have seen, according to White, Western Christianity, in its attempt to reject paganism, stripped off all the spirits and sacredness from nature. This desacralization combined with an anthropocentric view of the world provided a metaphysical justification for human exploitation of nature. Mumme argues that the model presented by the Viśiṣṭādvaita school fulfills the need for recognizing the sacred immanence of God in creation:

If [...] only a theology which values and sacralizes embodiedness can provide support for an ecological theology, then Śrīvaiṣṇava [i.e. Viśiṣṭādvaita] theology can fill the bill. I submit that it is an incarnational theology par excellence, with no conflict between divinity and embodiedness (2000: 143).

Mumme argues that the Viśiṣṭādvaita understanding of *Prakṛti* is a fertile ground for constructing ecological theology. As we have seen, according to Rāmānuja, the world is not only real but it is also the embodiment of God. In contrast to Advaita Vedānta, according to which the world is ultimately unreal and something to be cast aside all together, the Viśiṣṭādvaita view seems to be more helpful in recognizing the need for protecting our environment.

The Viśiṣṭādvaita understanding of *Prakṛti*, however, is not without a problem. Although Mumme confidently declares that Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta is ‘incarnational theology par excellence, *with no conflict between divinity and embodiedness* (emphasis mine)’ as quoted above, Jayatīrtha, an eminent proponent of Dvaita Vedānta, points out that Rāmānuja’s view does have a problem.

5. A Dvaita Vedānta Critique of Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta

Jayatīrtha’s critique in essence is that so long as Rāmānuja maintains a sharp distinction between *Brahman* and *Prakṛti*, he is not successful in proving the unity between the two. Or to put it in another way, the kind of unity Rāmānuja attributes to the relation between *Brahman* and *Prakṛti* does not afford him to regard *Brahman* to be the material cause of the world.

Jayatīrtha, in his commentary to the VeSū 1.4.23, says that the *Brahman* is the efficient cause of the universe which is also accepted by the Dvaita school. However, according to him, the problem concerning Rāmānuja is that he argues that *Brahman* is also the material cause:

Even though the material causality of *Brahman* with regard to the world, *as made out by Rāmānuja, is not in substance opposed to our position, still it cannot be accepted as the purport of these Sūtras in question.* For, let us ask, what is the point in elucidating this view here under these *Sūtras* ? It cannot be, as in the case of Bhāskara, the repudiation of the distinction between an efficient and a material cause, so far as *Brahman* is concerned. For, Rāmānuja accepts *Prakṛti* as the material cause (Tr. Sharma 2002: 245. Emphasis original) .

Jayatīrtha says that the logical implication of Rāmānuja’s view that *Prakṛti* is the body of *Brahman* should be that *Brahman* is the efficient cause of *Prakṛti*, and such a view is basically accepted by the Dvaita School. Jayatīrtha however rejects Rāmānuja’s claim that the body-soul analogy implies that *Brahman* is identical with *Prakṛti*. Such a view, according to Jayatīrtha, would put Rāmānuja into the

same position as Bhāskara, who accepts the identity of *Brahman* with *Prakṛti*, which results in a real transformation of *Brahman*. However, since Rāmānuja does maintain that *Brahman* is without any transformation, he cannot go as far as Bhāskara. Instead, Rāmānuja attributes real transformation to *Prakṛti*. This would imply that for Rāmānuja, *Prakṛti* and *Brahman* are indeed two separate entities. Therefore, Jayatīrtha says, Rāmānuja should not claim *Brahman* to be the material cause when he is not ready to accept the logical implication of such a view.

The Viśiṣṭādvaita view of *Prakṛti* as the body of God is certainly conducive to fostering our awareness of the sacredness of nature and of the interrelatedness of all beings. However, if we take seriously the criticism from the Dvaita Vedānta school, it turns out that the immanence of God as it is explained by the Viśiṣṭādvaita school is actually inconsistent since the body-soul analogy does not hold water.

Jayatīrtha's standpoint indeed appears to be logically sounder than that of Rāmānuja. The Dvaita Vedānta view of *Prakṛti*, however, does not seem to be so conducive to our environmental concern due to its emphasis on the transcendence of God and the complete separation of nature from Him. Certainly, its view of nature seems to be better than that of Advaita Vedānta, since, according to the Dvaita school, at least nature exists in reality. However, the Dvaita view accepts *Brahman* to be the efficient cause only in order to protect its absolute transcendence. This would make the Dvaita position closer to the position taken by Western Christianity, according to which the transcendence of God is also emphasized in fear of pantheism. We have seen that such an emphasis on transcendence led Christianity to reject God's immanence and deprive nature of all sacredness, thereby contributing to the current environmental crisis. At this point, we may ask, is there a system of Vedānta where immanence of God is maintained in such a way that it overcomes the criticism offered by Dvaita Vedānta. To such a question, I suggest that the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava view of *Prakṛti* maybe seen as an a viable option fulfilling such requirements.

6. Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava View of *Prakṛti*

Like Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta, Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava Vedānta also accepts *Brahman* to be the efficient and the material cause of the world. Unlike the Viśiṣṭādvaita school, however, Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava Vedānta argues that it is a potency (śakti) of *Brahman*. According to this view, the world manifests as a result of the real transformation of *Brahman*'s potency. Thus the Gauḍīya school holds the theory of transformation of a potency (śakti-pariṇāma-vāda). In this section, I will examine this theory based on Baladeva Vidyabhusana's GoBhā.

As in the case of Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja, anyone who argues that *Brahman* is both the material and the efficient cause has to deal with the tension between the unity of *Brahman* and Prakṛti and the perfection of *Brahman*. In the GoBhā 1.4.26. Baladeva says that *Brahman* as the possessor of the highest potency (i.e. the parā-śakti) is the efficient cause and *Brahman* as the possessor of two inferior potencies (i.e. the kṣetra-jñā-śakti and the avidyā-śakti) is the material cause:

It is taught that *Brahman* is the efficient cause as well as the material cause. In this regard, the first [i.e. that *Brahman* is the efficient cause] is because [It is] the possessor of the potency called the highest. But the second [i.e. that *Brahman* is the material cause] is because of two potencies other than that [i.e. other than the highest potency].

The two potencies, which are distinct from the highest potency, are the knower-of-the-field potency (the kṣetra-jñā-śakti) which constitutes the living entity and the nescience potency (the avidyā-śakti) which constitutes *Prakṛti*. According to Baladeva, *Brahman* is the material cause in the sense that these two potencies of *Brahman* evolve into the living entity and the universe. The fact that these potencies of *Brahman* are the material cause, however, does not contradict with the perfection of *Brahman*. Baladeva employs a certain logic (nyāya) to justify his position: '[This is so] on account of the logic that prescription and prohibition, which have specific qualities, [always] reside in an attribute.' Baladeva explains this logic in the SūTī, his commentary on the GoBhā:

With regard to a qualified object, prescription or prohibition aims at a qualification. This is the meaning. Just as in the case of a sentence, ‘A man is white’, in this sentence, the whiteness which is positively attributed to the person is recognized as amounting to a body, which is an attribute ['viśeṣaṇa'] [of the self] .’

The point here is that when it is said 'A is B', though A is the grammatical object of the predication B, A's attribute (*viśeṣaṇa*) can be the actual object of B's predication. Thus, when it is said 'A man is white', the predication i.e. his whiteness modifies not the man *per se* i.e. the self or *ātman*, but his body, which is his attribute. What Baladeva argues based on this hermeneutical tool is that when it is said that *Brahman* is the material cause, the state of being the material cause (*nimitta-kāraṇatva*) modifies *Brahman*'s potency, which is Its attribute, but it does not modify *Brahman*. Therefore, the characteristics of being changeable, imperfect and so on reside in the potency of *Brahman* but do not touch *Brahman* Itself.

Thus Baladeva takes a very similar position to Rāmānuja and says that although *Brahman* and *Prakṛti* are one, all the modifications and imperfections remain in *Prakṛti*. In contrast to Rāmānuja, however, Baladeva says that this *Prakṛti* is a potency of *Brahman*. Now the questions we need to ask are: What difference would it make if we accept *Prakṛti* as a potency of *Brahman*? ; Does Jayatīrtha's charge against Rāmānuja apply to Baladeva as well?

In reply, I propose that Baladeva's theory of transformation of potency (*śakti-pariṇāma-vāda*) has a fundamental advantage to Rāmānuja's body-soul analogy since this theory enables Baladeva to intelligently deal with Jayatīrtha's charge by adopting the concept of differentiation (*viśeṣa*), which he indeed borrows from the Dvaita Vedānta school.

Baladeva elaborates the concept of *viśeṣa* in his commentary on the VeSū 3.2.31. According to Baladeva, due to the effect of *viśeṣa*, which is inherent in any object, there is an appearance of difference between the attributes (*guṇas*) and the possessor of the attributes (*guṇin*), even though there is no ultimate distinction between the two. Quoting the ViPu 6.5.79, Baladeva points out that Bhagavān is both the attributes such as knowledge (*jñāna*), potency (*śakti*), power (*bala*),

sovereignty (aiśvarya), strength (vīrya), and splendor (tejas), and the possessor of these attributes. An implication of such a theory is that there is no ultimate difference between Brahman and Prakṛti, which is a potency of Brahman, even though there is an appearance of difference.

By employing such sophisticated hermeneutical and conceptual tools, Baladeva offers an attractive view of *Prakṛti* in relation to *Brahman*, which could be seen as an improvement of Rāmānuja's position. On the one hand, by employing a hermeneutical tool (nyāya), Baladeva argues that all the modifications and impurities attributed to *Prakṛti* remain in a potency of *Brahman* and they do not touch *Brahman* Itself. On the other hand, by employing a Dvaita Vedānta concept of *viśeṣa*, Baladeva argues that although there is difference between *Prakṛti* and *Brahman*, there is a fundamental unity among them. In this way, he suggests one way to overcome the challenge posed by the Dvaita Vedānta School.

7. The Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava View of Nature and Naess' Eight Platform Principle From Eco-centric to Theo-centric view of nature.

In his essay 'Self-realization', Naess discusses the concept of 'the ecological self'. The idea is that by identifying oneself with one's environment, care for the environment naturally follows, without being forced externally. In this way, Naess suggests that we should shift our understanding of nature from anthropocentric to eco-centric.

According to Naess, the concept of the ecological self is based on Gandhi's vision of non-duality (*advaita*). In this essay, I have argued that the view of nature according to the Vaiṣṇava Vedānta, particularly that of the Gauḍīya tradition, may best articulate Gandhi's vision, where the world of diversity is recognized as real and positive.

In this section, I will further elaborate the implications of the view of nature according to the Gauḍīya tradition. To do so, I will use Naess' eight platform principles to contrast with the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava view point. Here, I will argue that whereas Naess advocates the eco-centric view of nature, seeing nature as

the end in and of itself, the Gauḍīya view suggests the Theo-centric view of nature in which nature is valued due to its connection to the ultimate reality of Viṣṇu.

This Theo-centric view of nature is essential. As we have discussed in the previous section, the Gauḍīya view suggests that both living-entities and nature are the potencies of Viṣṇu. That is, they both belong to Him. Two implications of such an ontological view are: (1) since all the beings belong to Viṣṇu, their constitutional position is to be His servants, and everything they do must be done in His service; (2) since the material world also belongs to Viṣṇu, all material resources must be used for the service of Viṣṇu.

These two points are well articulated in the BhaGī, which was Gandhi's most favorite scripture. In the ninth chapter verse twenty-seven, Kṛṣṇa (i.e. Viṣṇu) tells Arjuna (a living entity):

Whatever you do, whatever you eat, whatever you sacrifice, whatever you give away [and] whatever austerity you perform, O son of Kuntī [i.e. Arjuna], you should do that as an offering to Me [i.e. Kṛṣṇa/Viṣṇu].

Here, it is clearly seen that according to the BhaGī, everything we do should be done for Kṛṣṇa / Viṣṇu. By implication it also means that everything used in our actions should be utilized in His service. These two premises correspond to the level 1 of the Aporon Diagram which Naess discusses (2005; 63). Based on these premises, now I shall elaborate the platform principles (the level 2 of the Aporon Diagram) according to the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava world-view. This will be done in the form of commenting on Naess' eight platform principles from the Gauḍīya perspective.

1. The flourishing of human and non-human life on Earth has inherent value. The value of non-human life-forms is independent of the usefulness of the non-human world for human purposes.

The Gauḍīya tradition would more or less agree with this point. According to the BhaGī 5.18, it is said:

Learned people see [the Supreme-self] equally in a Brāhmaṇa who is endowed with knowledge and discipline, a cow, an elephant, as well as a dog-eater.

The point of this verse is that according to the tradition, there is no spiritual hierarchy among any living beings, be they humans or non-humans, since the Supreme-self [*paramātmā*], the Lord Himself, is residing in each one of them. When we accept this point, respect to all the living beings becomes imperative since they are all manifestations of divine.

According to the Gauḍīya ontology, each living entity consists of four elements: the Supreme-self, an individual-self [*jīvātmā*], a subtle body [a conglomeration of intelligence, mind and ego], and a gross body [a conglomeration of five material elements namely, earth, water, fire, air, and ether]. In terms of the theory of transformation of potencies [*śakti-pariṇāma-vāda*], an individual-self corresponds to the *kṣetra-jñā-śakti* and both a subtle body and a gross body correspond to the *avidyā-śakti*. Note that both potencies belong to Viṣṇu. Whereas the Supreme-self and an individual-self are eternal, subtle and gross bodies are constantly changing. Following the law of *karma*, each individual-self, accompanied by the Supreme-self, transmigrates from one body to another:

Just as, in this body, the embodied ones [i.e. the individual-selves] experience youth, adolescence, and old age, in the same way, they obtain another bodies. A wise person is not perplexed on this matter (BhaGī 2.13).

Thus according to the BhaGī, an individual-self who has a human body now may obtain a non-human body in the next life, and vice versa. In such a world-view,

there is no clear-cut division between human beings and non-human beings as in the case of a certain trend of Christianity.

However, the Gauḍīya tradition, as in other Hindu traditions in general, does accord a special position to human beings, namely an opportunity to understand the ultimate reality and thereby to perform worship of God. According to the BhāPu, another important scripture in the tradition, it is said:

For mankind, that duty is the highest, from which there is unmotivated and unobstructed devotion to Viṣṇu and by which the self becomes pleased.

Such capacity to perform unmotivated devotion to the Lord is given only to human beings but not to non-human beings. The human form of life, therefore, is more important than other life forms in this sense. But such unique position of human beings does not justify any exploitation of non-human beings by human beings due to the reasons elaborated above.

2. Richness and diversity of life forms are also values in themselves and contribute to the flourishing of human and non-human life on Earth.

Commenting on this point, Naess writes:

So-called simple, lower, or primitive species of plants and animals contribute essentially to richness and diversity of life. They have value-in-themselves and are not merely steps towards the so-called higher or rational life forms. (2005: 69)

The Gauḍīya tradition would agree on this point. This point is probably most well expressed by the fact that Viṣṇu, according to the tradition, incarnates on earth in various forms, including the animal forms. Though He incarnates innumerable times, the well-known incarnations are ten. They are Matsya (fish), Kūrma (tortoise), Varāha (boar), Narasimha (half-lion, half-man), Vāmana (dwarf),

Paraśurāma (warrior), Rāma (human), Balarāma (human), Buddha (human), and Kalki (human). On this point, Ranchor Prime writes in his book *Hinduism and Ecology*:

That God should incarnate as an animal, even a supernatural one, shows that animals have an important role to play in God's eyes. They are not simply dumb beasts meant for satisfying human needs and appetites. They are living expressions of the spirit and of the presence of God (1994: 36).

As we discussed, according to the Gauḍīya view, God Himself is residing in each living entity, uniting all at the fundamental level. Therefore, all beings must be treated with respect and care. In the BhaGī 7.7. Kṛṣṇa says:

O Arjuna, there is nothing higher than Me. This entire universe rests on Me, like pearls rest on a string.

Appreciation of bio-diversity comes from the awareness that all beings are interconnected. Such awareness is clearly shown in this verse. But such interconnected-ness is due to the presence of God in all beings. Therefore, unlike Naess' view, the Gauḍīya view is essentially Theo-centric.

3. Humans have no right to reduce this richness and diversity except to satisfy *vital* needs.

The Gauḍīya view would agree on this point but again such an agreement is due to a different reason than Naess'. From the Gauḍīya perspective, humans should not take more than necessary, not because nature is important in and of itself but because it is a part of divine and it does not belong to humans. In the first verse of the *Īśopaniṣad*, which is a part of the Vedas, the authoritative scriptures in the Hindu traditions, it is said:

This visible world, and whatever exists beyond perception, is under the control of the Lord. Because of this you should enjoy only what is allotted to you by the Lord through karma. Do not hanker for more than that. Whose property is it? (Bhānu 2006: 13)

Since everything belongs to the Lord, human beings do not have proprietorship over His creation. Humans are allowed to take what is necessary for performing devotional service to the Lord. But they should not take anything for their own enjoyment. Rūpa Gosvāmī, one of the founding fathers of the Gauḍīya tradition, says:

When a person who is not attached to ordinary worldly objects suitably engages such objects and uses them in a relationship with Kṛṣṇa, that is called “proper renunciation”. (Haberman 2003: 75)

As we have seen, according to the Advaita Vedānta, the world of multiplicity is ultimately false and therefore, something to be rejected. In the verse twenty of the *Viveka-cūḍāmani*, a work traditionally attributed to Śaṅkara, it is said, ‘Brahman is real, the world is false’. However, according to the Gauḍīya tradition, the world is real, though it may be changing, since it is a part of the ultimate reality, Brahman. Therefore, the Gauḍīya Vedānta does not suggest a complete rejection of the world but a proper utilization of it in the service of the Lord.

Describing the third principle, Naess is emphatic that humans take only what is ‘*vital*’ for their maintenance. In this regard, the Gauḍīya tradition recommends that we take only vegetarian diet because meat consumption is an unnecessary luxury which burdens the environment. Mass production of meat leads to deforestation, soil erosion, air pollution and water pollution (Cremo and Gosvami 1995: 13-20). Meat consumption is also a major reason for starvation in the contemporary world due to its agricultural inefficiency (Dasa 2003: 52-3).

A more fundamental reason for adopting a vegetarian diet however, is because the tradition teaches that food must be first offered to the Lord to express

gratitude and only then can it be consumed as mercy [*prasāda*] of the Lord. This food offering must be vegetarian, since the Gītā Kṛṣṇa clearly says so:

I eat that which is offered with devotion by a person whose self is intent on devotion, who offers Me a leaf, a flower, a fruit or water with devotion.

The tradition takes this verse to be an injunction to offer vegetarian diet to the Lord. Since meat is not mentioned, it cannot be offered. Since it cannot be offered, it should not be taken as food. Here again, we observe that everything in the tradition, vegetarianism in this specific case, is based on the Theo-centric view of the world.

4. The flourishing of human life and cultures is compatible with a substantial decrease of the human population. The flourishing of non-human life requires such a decrease.

The Gauḍīya tradition does not necessarily agree with this view. According to the tradition, the earth can always provide enough resources for all the human beings, so long as they do not misuse the resources which are provided. Again, the point is that all the material resources belong to Viṣṇu. Therefore, the earth, as an agent of Viṣṇu, provides enough when human beings properly utilize material resources in His worship.

In this regard, an instructive conversation between Bhūmi, the personified earth and a king named Pṛthu is described in the fourth book, chapter eighteen of the BhāPu. In the conversation, Pṛthu asks Bhūmi why she is not producing enough food. In reply, she says that she withdrew food production since King Venu, Pṛthu's father, exploited the earth for his sake and did not worship Viṣṇu. Prime comments on this story:

Bhumi, mother Earth, is conscious of the behavior of human beings, and she responds to that behavior. If they treat her kindly she supplies them

with everything they need, but if she is mistreated she can keep back all these things. The way to please her and ensure abundance is through religious activity. Being herself a servant of God, she is pleased when God being worshipped. (1994: 33)

The same point is made in the BhaGī 3.14-5:

Living beings arise from food. Food arises from rain. Rain arises from sacrifice. Sacrifice arises from ritual action. Know that ritual action arises from the Vedas [and] the Vedas arise from the imperishable one [i.e. Brahman]. Therefore Brahman is all-pervading, eternal, and situated in sacrifice.

Here Kṛṣṇa [i.e. Brahman] says that the performance of sacrifice is vital for the production of food since rain arises from sacrifice. But what exactly is sacrifice and why is it important? In the context of the BhaGī, sacrifice ultimately means to dedicate whatever we do in the service of the Lord, as we saw in the verse 9.27. quoted above. Since all material resources are under the control of Kṛṣṇa, the Gauḍīya perspective on over-population is that as long as human beings properly utilizes the resources in the service of God, He always provides enough.

5. Present human interference with the non-human world is excessive, and the situation is rapidly worsening.

Here, Naess argues that the areas for nature-reserve should be extended:

The fight to preserve and extend areas of wilderness or near-wilderness should continue and focus on the general ecological functions of these areas. Very large wilderness areas are required in the biosphere to allow for continued evolutionary speciation of animals and plants. Present designated wilderness areas are too small and too few. (2005: 70)

Based on what we have discussed in relation to Naess' third platform principle, the Gauḍīya tradition would agree with Naess' fifth principle. Unnecessary luxury of meat consumption, for example, contributes to deforestation since meat production requires cultivation of vast land:

According to Vegetarian Times, half of the annual destruction of tropical rain forest is caused by clearing land for beef cattle ranches. Each pound of hamburger made from Central American or South American beef costs about 55 square feet of rain forest vegetation.

In the United States, about 260 million acres of forest have been cleared for a meat-centered diet. Each person who becomes a vegetarian saves one acre of trees per year.

About 40 % of the land in the Western United States is used for grazing beef cattle. This has had a detrimental effect on wildlife. Fencing has forced deer and antelope out of their natural habitats. (Cremo and Gosvami: 14-5)

As we have discussed, from the Gauḍīya perspective, meat consumption cannot be considered as a part of the process to serve God. Therefore, deforestation for the sake of meat production cannot be justified since it is a form of unnecessary exploitation of the earth. Similarly, any other types of deforestation as a result of industrial or agricultural exploitation will be rejected to the extent that it is done beyond what is vitally required for human beings.

6. In view of the foregoing points, policies must be changed. The changes in policies affect basic economic, technological, and ideological structures. The resulting state of affairs will be deeply different from the present and make possible a more joyful experience of the connectedness of all things.

Elaborating the six principle, Naess writes, ‘Economic growth as conceived and implemented today by the industrial states is incompatible with (1) – (5). “Green” economists have to be consulted (2005:70).’ Here Naess talks about a need for economy based on a new paradigm, which is different from the one currently operating in the capitalistic nations. Current capitalistic industrialization is based on the ego-centric view of the world, that is, a view in which value is based on what human beings can get for their sense gratification. Naess argues for a shift to the eco-centric view where the harmonious prosperity of both human beings and non-human beings is valued. The Gauḍīya tradition then, would argue for a shift to the Theo-centric view where the value is based on what one can offer in the service of God.

In our discussion on Naess’ first principle, we have seen that according to the Gauḍīya tradition, the highest duty of mankind is cultivation of devotion to God. Rūpa Gosvāmī gives one of the definitions of devotion [*bhakti*] as follows:

Bhakti is defined as service to the Lord using the senses. It should be done with the intention of pleasing the Lord, free of other desires, and unobstructed by other processes. (Bhānu 2006: 38)

In this definition, we see that in the process of bhakti, we are supposed to engage our senses. That is, we are expected to positively engage external sense objects in the service of God. Again, this positive view of the external world is something which is sharply different from the view according to Advaita Vedānta. An example of how to engage the senses in devotional service is described in the BhāPu 9.4.18-20:

Ambarīṣa engaged his mind in the two lotus-feet of Kṛṣṇa, his words in praising the virtues of Vaikuṇṭha [i.e. Kṛṣṇa’s spiritual abode], his two hands in cleaning Hari’s [i.e. Kṛṣṇa’s] temple, his ears in listening to the magnificent stories of Acyuta [i.e. Kṛṣṇa], his two eyes in seeing the images and shrines of Mukunda [i.e. Kṛṣṇa], his limbs in embracing the

bodies of the Lord's devotees, his nose in smelling the fragrance of the sacred Tulasī placed at the Lord's lotus-feet, his tongue in food that had been offered to the Lord, his two feet in traveling to the holy places of Hari, his head in bowing to the feet of Hṛṣīkeśa [i.e. Kṛṣṇa], and his desire in serving the Lord, not in ordinary objects of desire. He did all this out of love for the people devoted to Kṛṣṇa, the highest reality (Haberman 2003: 77 with my insertions in square brackets).

If we remember the Gauḍīya ontology, not only external sense objects but also our subtle body (a combination of mind, ego, and intelligence) and gross body with five senses are made of the material potency (*avidyā-śakti*) of the Lord. Therefore, this example of King Ambarīṣa shows how we should engage not only external sense objects such as fragrance, sound, sacred Tulasī plant and so on but also our senses and our mental capacity in the service of God.

Rūpā's definition of devotion further clarifies that such engagements of senses and sense objects should be done without any motivation for one's own sense enjoyment. This desire for selfless sacrifice makes a stark contrast with the exploitation of nature based on the ego-centric view of the world. According to the latter view, our happiness depends on what we get. The more we have the happier we become. But the former view, the view based on devotion, suggests that our happiness comes from giving, not from taking. The more we can offer in the service of God, the happier we become. According to the Gauḍīya view, since all the material resources belong to God, they are seen as mediums through which human beings can express their love to Him. Furthermore, since both human beings and non-human beings belong to God, non-human beings are seen as fellow worshippers of God along side with human beings, just as St. Francis of Assisi, the patron saint of ecology, preached his 'sister' birds to sing in the praise of God, according to his biographers. If policies are changed based on the Gauḍīya view of nature, certainly '[t]he resulting state of affairs will be deeply different from the present and make possible a more joyful experience of the connectedness of all things', as Naess suggests.

7. The ideological change is mainly that of appreciating life quality (dwelling in situations of inherent value) rather than adhering to an increasingly higher standard of living. There will be a profound awareness of the difference between big and great.

Here, Naess' concern is that we should focus on improving the quality of life rather than trying to accumulate material commodities more and more. The Gauḍīya tradition would more or less agree with this view. But more specifically, as we discussed, the tradition suggests that real quality of life is based on how selflessly we can serve God. The Gauḍīya tradition, along side with many other Hindu traditions, accepts the VeSū as one of the most authoritative scriptural sources where we can find information about the ultimate reality. The first aphorism of the VeSū says, 'Then, therefore, an inquiry into Brahman'. This aphorism suggests that human life is meant for understanding the ultimate reality (Brahman), not for pursuing material prosperity. Indeed, the BhaGī 16.21. says that lust, greed and anger are three gates which lead us to the hell. As eternal souls, we always look for eternal happiness. Therefore, our attempt to find happiness in material acquisition is bound to fail since anything material is temporal and changing. The BhaGī 5.21. says:

He who is unattached to the external contacts finds happiness within the self. Being engaged in the yoga of Brahman, he experiences imperishable happiness.

This verse teaches us that eternal happiness comes from our internal relationship with God. Therefore, according to the tradition, when we properly understand our constitutional position in relation to God, we realize that real happiness lies in cultivating our loving relationship with Him.

8. Those who subscribe to the foregoing points have an obligation directly or indirectly to participate in the attempt to implement the necessary changes. (Naess 2005: 68)

The Gauḍīya tradition would strongly encourage those who are conscious of current ecological crisis to re-examine and transform their way of living. Since the leaders of society – teachers, scientists, intellectuals, politicians, authors, artists, activists, entrepreneurs, and so on – have social influence, it is especially important that they teach moral standards in society by their own examples. The BhaGī 3.21. says:

Whatever a leader does, other people do exactly the same. He sets the standard which ordinary people follow.

In many Hindu traditions, there is an emphasis on moral integrity. It is not enough just to have knowledge. Real understanding should transform the way we live. Gandhi said, ‘My life is my message.’ When we subscribe to a certain world-view, certainly we must act based on such a view, so that our lives become our messages.

Conclusion

In this paper, first we have examined the relation between perception and behavior. White points out that the way we see nature has a profound effect on how we deal with nature. Realizing this point, Naess suggests the need for a paradigm shift from the anthropocentric view of nature to the eco-centric view of nature, which was inspired by Gandhi’s vision of world-affirming non-dualism.

Which school of Vedānta, then, best articulates Gandhi’s vision? If we accept Nelson’s analysis, Advaita Vedānta is not a good candidate since it says that the world is not ultimately real and its emphasis on the transcendence of *Brahman* leads us to a complete rejection of nature.

Dvaita Vedānta’s position seems to be better than that of Advaita Vedānta, since, according to that school, this universe is real. However, as the name of the

school suggests, it rejects the ontological unity between Brahman and nature. Thus it does not contribute to Gandhi's vision of non-duality.

The Viśiṣṭādvaita view of nature, in contrast, articulates Gandhi's vision much better, since it is both world-affirming and non-dual. As Mumme points out, the Viśiṣṭādvaita view of *Prakṛti* as the body of God certainly encourages us to develop environmental ethics and to become aware of the sacredness of nature. However, the Dvaita Vedānta criticism poses a serious challenge to the Viśiṣṭādvaita view of *Prakṛti*.

In response, I have suggested that the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava view of *Prakṛti* as a potency of *Brahman* maybe an alternative option. The recognition of *Prakṛti* as a potency of God helps us to become aware of His immanence. At the same time, the identification of *Prakṛti* with potency of *Brahman* makes it possible to recognize a fundamental unity between *Prakṛti* and Brahman, and in this way allows us to deal with the challenge posed by the Dvaita Vedānta School in a sophisticated manner. Of course, here I am not suggesting that Gandhi historically identified himself as a follower of the Gauḍīya tradition. What I am suggesting is that the kind of non-dualism Gandhi held, which later inspired Naess in starting his Deep Ecology movement, may be best articulated by a metaphysical understating of nature offered by Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava Vedānta.

In the second part of this paper, I further explored possible ecological implications of the Gauḍīya view of nature, particularly in relation to Naess' eight platform principles. Whereas Naess holds the eco-centric view of nature, the Gauḍīya tradition holds the Theo-centric view of nature. Certainly, there are some overlapping points between the two views. However, the Gauḍīya view of nature presupposes fundamentally different ontology than Naess' view of nature. The Gauḍīya tradition holds the view that both living beings and external material objects essentially belong to God. Two fundamental premises we can derive from such view of nature are that all living entities are meant to serve God and that all material resources are meant to be used in His service. According to the Gauḍīya tradition, however, Kṛṣṇa is not an angry God who demands service from living

entities. Rather, He is the all-attractive personality who enchants the heart of all beings by His sweet flute play:

O friend! Vṛndāvana is spreading the glory of the earth, having obtained the treasure of the lotus feet of Kṛṣṇa, the son of Devakī. The peacocks dance madly when they hear Govinda's flute, and when other creatures see them from the hilltops, they all become stunned (Prabhupāda: 2003).

The tradition suggests that the most natural state of living beings is to be madly in love with Kṛṣṇa, and when we are in love with God, our care for His belongings, which includes nature, certainly flows naturally.

Abbreviation

BhaGī – *Bhagavatd-gītā*

BhāPu – *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*

GoBhā – *Govinda-bhāṣya* of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

SūṬī – *Sūkṣma-ṭīkā* of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

VeSū – *Vedānta-sūtras* of Bādarāyaṇa

ViPu – *Viṣṇu-purāṇa*

Bibliography

Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa. (1912). *The Vedānta-Sūtras of Bādarāyaṇa: With the Commentary of Baladeva* tr. by Srisa Chandra Vasu, Sacred Books of the Hindus; V. 5. (Allahabad: The Pāṇīni office)

--- (1927). *Prameya-ratnāvalī of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa Edited with an Old Commentary Kantimālā and a New Original Commentary and Bengali Translation*, ed. by Akshaya Kumar Shastri (Calcutta, The Sanskrit Sahitya Parishat)

--- (1968). *Vedānta-sūtram śrī-govinda-bhāṣyaṇa sūkṣmā-ṭīkāyā ca sametam* 4 vols.

(Kolkata: Śrī Sārasvata Gauḍīyāsana Mission)

--- (2003). *The Prameyaratnāvalī* in Delmonico, N. *Vedantasara: First Steps in Vedanta - Vedantic Texts for Beginners* (New York, Global Scholarly Publications), pp. 99-167.

Bhānu, Swāmī (Trans.) (2006a). *Bhakti-Rasāmṛta-Sindhu By Śrīla Rūpa Gosvāmī* (Chennai:

Sri Vaikunta Enterprises)

--- (Trans.)(2006b) *Īśopaniṣad with the commentaries of Madhvācārya, Vedānta Deśika,*

Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa, Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura (Chennai: Sri Vaikunta Enterprises)

Cremo, Michael A. and Mukunda Goswami (1995) *Divine Nature: A Spiritual Perspective*

on the Environmental Crisis (Los Angeles: Bhaktivedanta Book Trust)

Gambhirananda, Swami. Trans. (2004). *Brahma-sūtra-bhāṣya of Śrī Śaṅkarācārya* (Kolkata: Advaita Ashrama)

Haberman, David L. (Trans.)(2003) *The Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu of Rūpa Gosvāmin* (New

Delhi: Indira Gandhi National Center for the Arts)

--- (2006). *River of Love in an Age of Pollution: The Yamuna River of Northern India*

(Berkeley: University of California Press)

McFague, Sallie. (1993). *The Body of God: An Ecological Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press)

Mumme, Patricia Y. (2000) ‘Models and Images for a Vaiṣṇava Environmental Theology: The Potential Contribution of Śrīvaiṣṇavism’ in *Purifying the Earthly Body of God: Religion and Ecology in Hindu India* ed. by Lance E Nelson (New Delhi: D. K. Printworld Ltd) pp. 133-62.

Naess, Alne (1987) 'Self Realization: An Ecological Approach to Being in the World'

Trumpeter Vol. 4 No. 3. pp. 35-42.

--- (2005) 'Tha Basics of Deep Ecology' *Trumpeter* Vol. 21. No. 1. pp. 61-71.

Nelson, Lance E. (2000). 'The Dualism of Nondualism: Advaita Vedānta and the Irrelevance of Nature' in *Purifying the Earthly Body of God: Religion and Ecology in Hindu India* (See Mumme 2000) pp. 61-88.

Okita, Kiyokazu. (2008) 'Mādhva or Gauḍīya? The Philosophy of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa's *Prameya-ratnāvalī*', in *the Journal of Vaishnava Studies*, vol. 16, no. 2, Spring 2008, ed. by Steven J. Rosen, pp. 33-48.

Prabhupāda, A.C. Bhaktivedānta Swami. (2003) *The Complete Teachings*. Folio Infobase

Program (NC: Bhaktivedanta Archives)

Prime, Ranchor (1994). *Hinduism and Ecology: Seeds of Truth* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass

Publishers)

Raghavachar, S. S. (2002). *Vedārtha-saṅgraha of Śrī Rāmānujācārya* (Kolkata: Advaita Ashrama)

Rangacharya, M. and M. B. Varadaraja Aiyangar (2002). *The Vedāntasūtras with the Śrībhāṣya of Rāmānujācārya* Vol. II. (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd.)

Sharma, B. N. K. (2002) *Philosophy of Śrī Madhvācārya*. Revised edition (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers)

Thibaut, George. (1904) *The Vedānta-sūtras with Commentary by Rāmānuja*. Sacred Bools of the East, Vol. 48

White, Linn. (1967). 'Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis.' *Science* 155, no. 3767 (March): 1203-7.

I thank the following people for their advice and comments on this paper (names in the alphabetical order): Michael A. Cremo (Los Angeles), Prof. Lance E. Nelson (University of California, Sandiego) Marie Ann Ostlund (Oxford), Stefanie Schott (Belgium), Re'em Stern (India),

yady api paravyutpāditam brahmaṇo jagad-upādānatvaṃ nāsmākam arthato virodhi, tathāpi naiteṣāṃ sūtrāṇāṃ arthaḥ / tathāhi, kim atrāsyā vyutpādanasya kṛtyam ? na tāvad bhāskarasyeva nimittopādāna-bheda-nirākaraṇam, pradhānasyopādānatayāṅgīkṛtatvāt /

tasya nimittatvam upādānatvaṃ cābhidhīyate / tatrādyam parākhya-śaktimad-rūpeṇa, dvitīyam tu tad-anya-śakti-dvaya-dvāraiva / The potencies of Brahman is categorized into the *parā-śakti* and the *aparā-śakti*. The latter is further divided into the *kṣetra-jñā-śakti* and the *avidyā-śakti*.

saviśeṣaṇe vidhi-niṣedhau viśeṣaṇam upasaṅkrāmata iti nyāyāt / viśiṣṭe vastuni yo vidhir niṣedhaś ca sa khalu viśeṣaṇa-paryavasāyīty arthaḥ / yathā gaurah pumān ity atra gauratvaṃ puṃso vihitam tat khalu viśeṣaṇa-deha-paryavasāyi pratītam / yathā bhagavat-kaiṅkarya-pratibandhī stambho nindya ity atra (atra em. Isaacson ; arthaḥ SūTī) tat-kaiṅkarya-pratibandhitvaṃ stambhasya viśeṣaṇam niśidhyate / mā bhūd ity tathaitad bodhyam /

viśeṣas tu bheda-pratinidhir bhedaḥbhāve 'pi bheda-kāryasya dharma-dharmi-bhāvāder vyavahārasya nirvartakaḥ /

yat karoṣi yad aśnāsi yaj juhoṣi dadāsi yat / yat tapasyasi kaunteya tat kuruṣva mad-arpaṇam //

These eight platform principles are taken from Naess 2005.

vidyā-vinaya-saṃpanne brāhmaṇe gavi hastini / śuni caiva śvapāke ca paṇḍitāḥ sama-darśinaḥ //
dehino 'smin yathā dehe kaumāraṃ yauvanaṃ jarā / tathā dehāntaraprāptir dhīras tatra na muhyati //

BhāPu 1.2.6. sa vai puṃsām paro dharmo yato bhaktir adhokṣaje / ahaituky apratihatā yayātmā suprasīdati //

mattaḥ parataram nānyat kiṃ cid asti dhanamjaya / mayi sarvam idam protam sūtre maṇigaṇā iva //

īśāvāsyam idam sarvaṃ yat kiṅca jagatyāṃ jagat / tena tyaktena bhuñjīthā mā gṛdhaḥ kasya svid dhanam //

The Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu 1.2.255: anāsaktasya viṣayān yathārham
upayuñjataḥ /

nirbandhaḥ kṛṣṇa-sambandhe yuktaṁ vairāgyam ucyate //

brahma satyaṁ jagan mithyā [...] I thank Rembert Lutjeharms for this reference.

BhaGī 9.26. patraṁ puṣpaṁ phalaṁ toyam yo me bhaktyā prayacchati / tad ahaṁ
bhakty-upahṛtaṁ aśnāmi prayatātmanaḥ //

BhāPu 1.2.6.

sarvopādhi-vinirmuktaṁ tat-paratvena nirmalam /

hr̥ṣīkeṇa hr̥ṣīkeśa-sevanam bhaktir ucyate //

sa vai manaḥ kṛṣṇa-padāravindayor

vacāṁsi vaikunṭha-guṇānuvarṇane /

karau harer mandira-mārjanādiṣu

śrutim cakārācyuta-sat-kathodaye //

mukunda-liṅgālaya-darśane dṛśau

tad-bhṛtya-gātra-sparśe 'ṅga-saṅgamam /

ghrāṇam ca tat-pāda-saroja-saurabhe

śrīmat-tulasyā rasanām tad-arpite //

pādau hareḥ kṣetra-padānusarpaṇe

śiro hr̥ṣīkeśa-padābhivandane /

kāmaṁ ca dāsyē na tu kāma-kāmyayā

yathottamaḥśloka-janāśraya ratih //

In this context, St. Francis' Canticle of the Creatures very much resonates the
Gauḍīya view of the world:

All praise be yours, My Lord,
through all that you have made.

And first my lord Brother Sun, who brings the day....

How beautiful is he, how radiant in all his splendor!

Of you, Most High, he bears the likeness.

All praise be yours, my Lord, through Sister Moon and Stars;

In the heavens you have made them, bright and precious and fair.
All praise be yours, my Lord, through Brothers Wind and Air....
All praise be yours, my Lord, through Sister Water,
So useful, lowly, precious and pure.
All praise be yours, my Lord, through Brother Fire,
through whom you brighten up the night....
All praise be yours, my Lord, through Sister Earth, our mother,
Who feeds us...and produces various fruits
With colored flowers and herbs....
Praise and bless my Lord, and give him thanks,
And serve him with great humility.
[from *St. Francis of Assisi: Writings and Early Biographies*,
edited by Marion A. Habig, ©1973 by Franciscan Herald Press]
athāto brahma-jijñāsā //

trividhaṃ narakasyedaṃ dvāraṃ nāśanam ātmanaḥ /
kāmaḥ krodhas tathā lobhas tasmād etat trayam tyajet //
bāhyasparśeṣv asaktātmā vindaty ātmani yat sukham /
sa brahmayogayuktātmā sukham akṣayam aśnute //
yad yad ācarati śreṣṭhas tat tad evetaro janaḥ /
sa yat pramāṇam kurute lokas tad anuvartate //
BhāPu 10.21.10. *vṛndāvanaṃ sakhi bhuvo vitanoti kīrtiṃ yad devakī-suta-*
padāmbuja-labdha-lakṣmi
/ govinda-veṇuṃ anu matta-mayūra-nṛtyaṃ prekṣyādri-sānv-avaratānya-samasta-
sattvam //

PAGE

PAGE 1

